

REMARKS

This paper is responsive to the Office Action mailed from the Patent and Trademark Office on March 30, 2005, which has a shortened statutory period set to expire June 30, 2005.

Claims 1-9, 17-24, and 31-40 are pending in the above-identified application. Claims 1, 3, 5 and 9 are rejected under 35 USC 102, and Claim 2 is rejected under 35 USC 103. Claims 4, 6-8 and 34 are objected to as being dependent from a rejected base claim, but are otherwise indicated as being allowable. Claims 17-24, 31-34 and 35-40 are allowed.

In the current paper, Claims 1, 4, 6 and 34 are amended. Claims 2, 5, 7-9, 17-24, 31-33 and 35-40 remain as filed. No new matter is entered. In view of these amendments and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of all pending rejections.

Rejections Under 35 USC 102/103

Claim 1, 3, 5 and 9 are rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent Application Publication 2002/0164893 (herein "Mathieu").

Claim 1 is amended herein to recite (in pertinent part):

...a plated metal layer including a first layer formed on the first surface of the free portion of the spring metal finger and a second layer formed on the second surface of the free portion of the spring metal finger;

wherein both the first layer and the second layer of the plated metal layer have a thickness that is both smaller than the predetermined distance, and greater than a thickness of the spring metal finger.

Support for the amendment to Claim 1 is as follows. The recitation of "first layer" and "second layer" of the "plated metal layer" is found in Applicants' specification in paragraph 0038 (see page 12: "In particular, as indicated in Fig. 1, plating metal layer 130 includes an upper layer 136 formed on an

upper surface 126 of spring metal finger 120, and a lower layer 137 formed on a lower surface 127 of free portion 125.") The recitation of "wherein both the first layer and the second layer of the plated metal layer have a thickness...greater than a thickness of the spring metal finger" is supported by a combination of paragraph 0039 (see page 12: "In one practical embodiment, plating thickness T1 is 1.5 microns...") and paragraph 0045 (see page 15: "In one embodiment, which utilizes a 0.2 micron Ti release material layer 214, stress-engineered metal film 220 includes Molybdenum and Chromium (MoCr) sputter deposited to a thickness of 1 micron.")

As amended, Claim 1 is distinguished over Mathieu in that Mathieu teaches that the thickness of spring 110 (see Mathieu's paragraph 0054: "The conductive material of interconnection element 110 can be thought of as deposited in several sub-layers to a final thickness. U.S. Pat. No. 5,613,861 describes several layers of conductive material deposited to a final thickness of approximately one micron") is larger than the thickness of coating 170 (see Mathieu's paragraph 0085: "FIG. 11 also shows composite interconnection element 110A having an overcoating of a contact material, such as electroless or electroplated gold coated to a few micro-inches (a few thousand angstroms) to improve the electrical conduction properties (e.g., lower the resistance) of composite interconnection element 110A. It is to be appreciated that coating 170 is optional in this embodiment."). Accordingly, amended Claim 1 is believed to be distinguished over Mathieu at least because Mathieu fails to teach "wherein both the first layer and the second layer of the plated metal layer have a thickness that is both smaller than the predetermined distance, and greater than a thickness of the spring metal finger", as recited in Claim 1.

Claims 3, 5 and 9 are dependent from Claim 1, and are believed to be distinguished over Mathieu for at least the reasons provided above with reference to Claim 1.

For the above reasons, Applicants' respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 USC 102.

Rejections Under 35 USC 103

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious in view of Mathieu.

Claim 2 is dependent from Claim 1, and is believed to be distinguished over Mathieu for at least the reasons provided above with reference to Claim 1.

For the above reasons, Applicants' respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 USC 103.

Objections

Claims 4, 6-8 and 34 are objected to as being dependent from a rejected base claim, but are otherwise indicated as being allowable.

Claims 4 and 6 are amended to incorporate the limitations of Claim 1 (as filed), thus placing these claims in condition for allowance.

Claims 5 and 8 remain dependent from Claim 1, and are believed to be distinguished over Mathieu for at least the reasons provided above with reference to Claim 1.

Claim 34 is amended to depend from Claim 31, thus correcting an obvious typographical error.

For the above reasons, Applicants' respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections.

CONCLUSION

For the above reasons, Applicants believe Claims 1-9, 17-24 and 31-40 are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have any questions regarding the present paper, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,



Customer No.: 28014

Patrick T. Bever
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 33,834
Phone: (408) 451-5902

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as FIRST CLASS MAIL in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA, 22313-1450 on June 30, 2005.

6/30/2005
Date

Rebecca A. Baumann
Signature: Rebecca A. Baumann